

VOLUME 7. Parts 7/8

pp. 189-230, T.P.—iv

15th April, 1952

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

at the Publications Office of the Trust

41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1952

Price Twenty shillings

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President: Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President: Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.)

Vice-President: Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.) (*President*) (1st January 1944)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary: Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist: Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Registrar: Mr. A. S. Pankhurst

Publications Officer: Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission: 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust: 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

VOLUME 7

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

LONDON :

**Printed by Order of the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature**

and

**Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust**

41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1952

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.) (*President*) (1st January 1944)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)

Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)

Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Registrar : Mr. A. S. Pankhurst

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Note: The present volume constitutes part of the Agenda for the Session of Meetings to be held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at Copenhagen in 1953 during the Assembly of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology. The papers published in the present volume have all been written for the foregoing purpose by Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*)

	<i>Page</i>
Seven problems of zoological nomenclature involving the clarification, amendment or expansion of the <i>Règles Internationales</i> , which will be considered by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology Copenhagen, 1953: Preliminary appeal to zoologists for advice ..	1
The emendation of zoological names: an appeal to zoologists for advice ..	4
Proposed clarification, amendment and expansion of the provisions in the <i>Règles</i> relating to the formation of the names of families and subfamilies and subordinate categories of suprageneric rank: an appeal to zoologists for advice	61
Problems requiring consideration if provisions relating to the naming of Orders and higher taxonomic categories are to be included in the <i>Règles</i> : an appeal to zoologists for advice	95
On the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was published prior to 1st January 1931 in the synonymy of a previously established nominal genus: an appeal to zoologists for advice	109
The application to be given to a trivial name which, when first published was both applied to a particular species or to particular specimens and also stated to be a substitute name for some previously published trivial name or is clearly implied to be such a substitute: an appeal to zoologists for advice	119
On the question whether "neotypes" should be recognised in the <i>Règles</i> as a category of type specimen: an appeal to zoologists for advice ..	131
On the means to be found for promoting the greatest possible stability in zoological nomenclature: an appeal to zoologists for advice ..	148

	<i>Page</i>
Preliminary Report on twenty-eight individual nomenclatorial problems remitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomen- clature for special investigation: Request to specialists for advice	191
(a) Six cases on which the investigation asked for has been completed	195
(b) Two cases arising out of decisions taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the status of in- dividual books	198
(c) Three cases arising out of a subject which has been dealt with incompletely in a previously rendered <i>Opinion</i>	201
(d) One case concerned with the nomenclatorial status of a book	203
(e) One case concerned with the relative priority to be assigned to certain books dealing with the same subject and published on unknown dates in the same year	204
(f) Fifteen cases relating to individual names	206
Note on the dates of publication of the several portions of the present volume	230

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 7, Parts 7/8 (pp. 189-230, T.P.—iv)

15th April, 1952

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

1. The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51-56, 57-59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July, 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5-13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Double Part (vol 7, Double Part 7/8) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so, in writing, to the Secretary to the Commission as quickly as possible and in any case in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases

NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers is involved in applications published in the present Double Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

- (1) names for butterflies published in 1775 (a) in vol. 1 of Cramer's *Urilandsche Kapellen*, (b) in the "Wiener Verzeichniss" of Denis & Schiffermüller, (c) in Fabricius' *Systema Entomologiae*, and (d) in von Rottenburg's *Anmerkungen* published in vols. 6 and 7 of the *Naturforscher*, determination of relative priority of (Z.N.(S.)448).
- (2) *Naucoris* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), proposed validation of (Z.N.(S.)608).
- (3) *geoffroyi* Leach, 1817 (as published in the combination *Corixa geoffroyi* (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), proposed validation of (Z.N.(S.)609).

- (4) *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the combination *Cancer quadratus*) (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), possible suppression of (Z.N.(S.)271).
- (5) *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, proposed validation of, and suppression of *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821 (Class Gastropoda) (Z.N.(S.)27).
- (6) *Petalifera* Gray, 1847 (Class Gastropoda), possible validation of (Z.N.(S.)150).
- (7) *punctata* Cuvier, 1803 (as published in the combination *Aplysia punctata*) (Class Gastropoda), proposed validation of, by suppression of *rosea* Rathke, 1799 (as published in the combination *Aplysia rosea*) (Z.N.(S.)611).
- (8) *Ammonia* Brunnich, 1771 (Class Cephalopoda or Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera), possible suppression of (Z.N.(S.)612).
- (9) *Encrinus* Schulze, 1760 (Class Crinoidea), proposed validation of, with *Encrinus liliiformis* Lamarck, 1801, as type species (Z.N.(S.)434).
- (10) *Archaeocidaris* McCoy, 1844 (Class Echinoidea), proposed validation of (Z.N.(S.)320).
- (11) *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen, 1869 (Class Echinoidea), proposed validation of (Z.N.(S.)435).
- (12) *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883, and *Typhlechinus* Neumayr, 1889 (Class Echinoidea) (genera based upon misidentified type species) determination of type species of; suggested suppression of above names to validate *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912 (Z.N.(S.)613).
- (13) *Odobenus* Brissoni, 1762 (Class Mammalia), proposed validation of; problem arising in connection with the name *Rosmarus* Brunnich, 1771 (Z.N.(S.)614).
- (14) *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia), determination of type species of; possible suppression of the name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (as published in the combination *Mus laniger*) (Z.N.(S.)141).

2. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 56), corresponding Notices have been sent to the journals "Nature" and "Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING

*Secretary to the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature*

Secretariat of the
International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature,
28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.
15th April, 1952.

**PRELIMINARY REPORT ON TWENTY-EIGHT INDIVIDUAL
NOMENCLATORIAL PROBLEMS REMITTED BY THE
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL
NOMENCLATURE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATION:
REQUEST TO SPECIALISTS FOR ADVICE**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)53)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory	195
 (a) Six cases on which the investigation asked for has been completed	
Case 1: Status of names published in Oken (L.) [1815-1816] <i>Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte</i>	195
Case 2: Status of the generic name <i>Limulus</i> Müller (O.F.), 1785 (Class Merostomata)	196
Case 3: Status of the generic name <i>Orthoceros</i> Brünnich, 1771 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea)	196
Case 4: Type species of the genus <i>Colymbus</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves)	197
Case 5: Status of the generic name <i>Dama</i> Zimmermann, 1780, and of the trivial name <i>virginiana</i> Zimmermann, 1780 (as published in the binominal combination <i>Dama virginiana</i>) (Class Mammalia) ..	197
Case 6: Status of the generic name <i>Manatus</i> Brünnich, 1771 (Class Mammalia)	198

(b) Two cases arising out of decisions taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the status of individual books

- Case 7: Question of the use of the plenary powers to validate certain generic names in common use published in 1762 by Etienne Louis Geoffroy in his *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* 198
- Case 8: Determination of the genera to which are referable the species in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) which would have been the type species of the monotypical genera established in Jacob Hübner's *Tentamen* of 1806 if that leaflet had satisfied the requirements of Article 25 199

(c) Three cases arising out of a subject which has been dealt with incompletely in a previously rendered "Opinion"

- Case 9: Question whether the type species of certain nominal genera are to be treated as having been indicated by absolute tautonomy (question left unsettled in *Opinion* 16) 201
- (a) Names of two genera of the Class Mammalia 202
- (b) Names of twenty-two genera of the Class Aves 202
- (c) Names of two genera of the Class Pisces 202
- (d) Name of one genus in the Phylum Protozoa 202
- Case 10: Question of the type species of the genus *Pleuronectes* Linnaeus, 1758 (question left unsettled in *Opinion* 68) 202
- Case 11: Question of the type species of the genus *Sparus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces) (question left unsettled in *Opinion* 69) 203

(d) One case concerned with the nomenclatorial status of a book

- Case 12: Question of the nomenclatorial status of Brisson (M. J.), 1762, *Regnum Animale* (ed. 2) 203

(e) One case concerned with the relative priority to be assigned to certain books dealing with the same subject and published on unknown dates in the same year

- Case 13 : Question of the relative priority to be accorded to names published for butterflies in 1775 in certain books and papers (a) by Pieter Cramer ; (b) by J. N. C. M. Denis & Ignaz Schiffermüller ; (c) by Johann Christian Fabricius, and (d) by S. A. von Rottemburg 204

(f) Fifteen cases relating to individual names

- Case 14 : Question of the species to which the trivial name *annulatum* commonly treated as having been published by Dschunkowsky & Luhs in 1904 (in the combination *Piropasma annulatum*) (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida) is to be treated as applicable 206
- Case 15 : Question whether it is desirable, in the interest of stability and to avoid confusion, to validate the generic name *Naucoris* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) under the plenary powers 207
- Case 16 : Question whether *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, is the oldest available name, either subjectively or objectively, for the species so named 208
- Case 17 : Question of the trivial name to be accepted as the trivial name of the Sand Crab (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) 209
- Case 18 : Question of the relative status of the generic names *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaca* Eschscholtz, 1833 (Class Gastropoda) 210
- Case 19 : Question of the relative advantages of using the generic names *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, and *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872 (Class Gastropoda) for the genus so named 211
- Cases 20 and 21 : Question of the future status to be accorded to the trivial names *fasciata* Poiret, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia fasciata*) and *punctata* Cuvier, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia punctata*) (Class Gastropoda) 212
- Case 22 : Question of the status to be accorded to the generic name *Ammonia* Brünnich, 1771 (Class Cephalopoda or Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) 215

	<i>Page</i>
Case 23: Question of the status to be accorded to the generic name <i>Encrinus</i> Schulze, 1760, and the species to be accepted as its type species (Class Crinoidea)	216
Case 24: Question of the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name <i>Echinocrinus</i> Agassiz, 1841, and to validate the name <i>Archaeocidaris</i> McCoy, 1844 (Class Echinoidea) . .	217
Case 25: Question of the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name <i>Protoechinus</i> Austin, 1860, for the purpose of validating the name <i>Pholidocidaris</i> Meek & Worthen, 1869 (Class Echinoidea)	219
Case 26: Question of the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic names <i>Eriechinus</i> Pomel, 1883, and <i>Typhlechinus</i> Neumayr, 1889, for the purpose of validating the name <i>Lovenechinus</i> Jackson, 1912 (Class Echinoidea)	220
Case 27: Question of the status to be accorded to the generic name <i>Rosmarus</i> Brännich, 1771 (Class Mammalia)	225
Case 28: Question of the species to be treated as the type species of the nominal genus <i>Chinchilla</i> Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia) . .	226

Introductory

1. In addition to the seven general problems relating to the interpretation of the *Règles*, the possible recasting of certain existing provisions or the addition of new provisions, twenty-eight individual nomenclatorial problems were specifically referred by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its meeting held in Paris in 1948 to myself, as its Secretary, for investigation, in conjunction with interested specialists, and for Report. It is essential that the Reports asked for in regard to all these cases should be completed in time for the consideration by the International Commission at latest at its Session to be held in Copenhagen in 1953; I am most anxious, therefore, to engage the interest of specialists in these cases and to obtain assistance and advice from them in regard thereto as soon as possible. These cases were all specifically noted as cases which were to be subject to investigation in the *Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission* at its Paris Session published in 1950 in volume 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*; moreover, in order to draw attention to the procedure agreed upon in regard to them, a summary list of these cases was specially inserted in the index to the foregoing volume (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 750-751).

2. The purpose of the present Preliminary Report is to give particulars of the progress so far made in regard to these cases, to state briefly the issues involved in regard to the remainder, and to invite the help of specialists in the groups concerned in devising satisfactory solutions in regard to those problems on which Reports have yet to be prepared. For this purpose I have in the present Report grouped these cases, in the first place, by reference, to the stage already reached and the nature of the investigation involved, and in the second place, by reference to the groups within the Animal Kingdom to which are referable each of the taxonomic units, the name properly applicable to which is to form the subject of the investigations now to be undertaken.

(A) SIX CASES ON WHICH THE INVESTIGATION ASKED FOR HAS BEEN COMPLETED

Case 1: Status of names published in Oken (L.) [1815-1816], "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte"

(Sec 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 365-366)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)153)

3. A comprehensive Report on the status of names, as published in 1815-1816 in the *Zoologie* volume of Lorenz Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, has been prepared in consultation with interested specialists and will be published in an early Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. In addition,

steps are being taken to obtain from specialists their views as to which of the Oken names ought, in the interest of stability and for the purpose of avoiding confusion, to be preserved with priority as from Oken in the event of its being decided that from the nomenclatorial standpoint Oken's *Lehrbuch* is not an acceptable work. It would be particularly helpful if specialists in as many groups as possible would co-operate with the Commission by sending statements of their views on the foregoing subject, so far as concerns names of genera and/or species in their own groups. Such information will be of great value, in whichever sense the International Commission answer the question raised in the present case, for, if it is decided that the *Lehrbuch* is an acceptable work, it will be possible at once to place on the *Official List* generic names so submitted by specialists.

**Case 2 : Status of the generic name "Limulus" Müller (O.F.),
1785 (Class Merostomata)**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 311-312)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)506)

4. The problem to be considered here is whether action should be taken under the plenary powers to prevent the very well-known generic name *Limulus* Müller (O.F.), 1785 (Class Merostomata) from being replaced by the hitherto virtually unused name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771, found to be an available name as the result of the decision that in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* of 1771 (in which this name was published) Brünnich satisfied the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25. A subsidiary question involved in the foregoing problem arises from the fact that as long ago as 1928 the name *Limulus* Müller was placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. A comprehensive statement of the issues involved in this case, with recommendations as to the action which it is desirable should be taken, has been submitted by Professor Leif Størmer (Oslo). This has now been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 319-322); the proposals so submitted are supported by Professor Munro Fox (London University) (: 322) and by Dr. Carl O. Dunbar (Yale University) (: 323).

**Case 3 : Status of the generic name "Orthoceros" Brünnich,
1771 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea)**

(See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 312-313)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)44)

5. The ruling that Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* is a nomenclatorially acceptable work makes it necessary to reach a decision on the question whether the generic name *Orthoceros* Brünnich, 1771, should be brought into use or whether to do so would be likely to give rise to such confusion that the use by the Commission of its plenary powers would be called for. The problem so involved is bound up with the question of the treatment to be accorded to the well-known name *Orthoceras* Bruguière, 1789, on which a number of years

earlier an application had been submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. A. K. Miller (University of Iowa). In this case a comprehensive Report has been prepared in consultation with Dr. Miller, Dr. Curt Teichert (Melbourne, Australia), Dr. C. J. Stubblefield (Geological Survey and Museum, London) and others. This Report will be published, for the consideration of the Commission, in an early Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*.

**Case 4 : Type species of the genus "Colymbus" Linnaeus, 1758
(Class Aves)**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 361-363)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)78)

6. The question of the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) was submitted to the International Commission many years before the outbreak of the War of 1939-45, but no decision was ever reached thereon. At Paris the Commission agreed that a decision should be taken with the least possible further delay and asked for a Report discussing the problems involved in applying Article 30 in this case. Before this Report could be prepared, the ornithologists assembled at the International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala in June, 1950, set up a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature for the purpose of formulating proposals in regard to this and other cases for the consideration of the Commission. The Standing Committee has now submitted proposals in regard to this case and the paper so received will shortly be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, together with the Report asked for in Paris.

**Case 5 : Status of the generic name "Dama" Zimmermann,
1780, and of the trivial name "virginiana" Zimmermann, 1780
(as published in the binominal combination "Dama
virginiana") (Class Mammalia)**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 549-551)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)96)

7. The problem raised by the generic name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, and by the trivial name *virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780 (as published in the binominal combination *Dama virginiana*) (Class Mammalia) was considered in Paris by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, which, after concluding that the foregoing were available names, placed on record its view that confusion must be expected if the generic name *Dama* was to be transferred from the Fallow Deer of Europe to the Virginia Deer of America and asked that steps should be taken to consult interested specialists on the question whether the degree of confusion to be so expected was likely to be such that it would be desirable for the Commission to use its plenary powers to prevent that confusion from arising. A definite proposal on this subject has now been received from Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (British Museum (Natural History)); the application so submitted has since received support

from Dr. Karl P. Schmidt (Chief Curator of Zoology, Chicago Natural History Museum) and from Dr. Colin Campbell Samborn, Dr. D. Dwight Davis, Dr. Bryan Patterson and Dr. Rainer Zangeri (Curators respectively of Zoology, Mammals, Anatomy, Fossil Mammals, and Fossil Reptiles at the above Museum) and from Dr. Robert K. Enders (Swathmore College, Pennsylvania). Mr. Morrison-Scott's application and the comments on it will shortly be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* for consideration by the International Commission.

**Case 6 : Status of the generic name "Manatus" Brünnich, 1771
(Class Mammalia)**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 313)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)515)

8. At its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, after ruling that generic names published by Brünnich in 1771 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* possessed rights under the Law of Priority, decided that, in view of the risk that the application of this decision of principle might lead in individual cases to confusion or undesirable name-changing, each of the names concerned should be investigated separately in conjunction with interested specialists. One of the names so referred was the name *Manatus* Brünnich, 1771 (Class Mammalia). A Report on this case has now been completed and is being published in Part 5 of Volume 6 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (pp. 159-160).

**(B) TWO CASES ARISING OUT OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL
NOMENCLATURE ON THE STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL
BOOKS**

**Case 7 : Question of the use of the plenary powers to validate
certain generic names in common use published in 1782 by
Etienne Louis Geoffroy in 1762 in his "Histoire abrégée des
Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris"**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 366-369.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)168)

9. At its Paris Session held in 1948, the International Commission ruled that in the *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* published in 1762 Geoffroy (E. L.) had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature and therefore that, under the decision taken earlier during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology to amend Proviso (b) to Article 25 by substituting the words "nomenclature binominale" for the words "nomenclature binaire" (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63-66), the generic names published in the foregoing work were not available under the Law of

Priority. At the same time, however, the Commission placed on record its view that certain of the generic names published by Geoffroy in his *Histoire abrégée* were in such wide use that they should certainly be validated under the plenary powers under the procedure for ensuring that the smooth introduction of the amendment of Article 25 noted above prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology when making that amendment. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature accordingly agreed that steps should be taken to obtain views on this subject from specialists in the groups concerned.

10. Applications have been received under the foregoing invitation in respect of certain individual names but what is required, in order finally to dispose of the so-called "Geoffroy problem," is the systematic examination of the *Histoire abrégée*, Order by Order, followed by the submission to the Commission of proposals for the validation under the plenary powers of any names which specialists may consider it essential should be preserved if confusion is to be avoided and for the placing on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* of all other generic names in the Order concerned that were first published in the *Histoire abrégée*. Entomologists who are specialists in the Orders dealt with by Geoffroy in the foregoing work are particularly asked to promote stability in the nomenclature in their respective groups by disposing of the Geoffroy problem once and for all by undertaking reviews of the names published in the *Histoire abrégée* along the lines suggested by the International Commission.

Case 8 : Determination of the genera to which are referable the species in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) which would have been the type species of the monotypical genera established in Jacob Hübner's "Tentamen" of 1806 if that leaflet had satisfied the requirements of Article 25

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 496)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)314)

11. At its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration the procedure to be adopted for the purpose of laying the ghost of the "Tentamen problem" which earlier in the present century had caused so much confusion in the generic nomenclature of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta). The basic problem whether the terms used as the names of monotypical genera were acceptable as generic names as from the distribution of the *Tentamen* in 1806 was settled by the Commission's *Opinion* 97 published in 1926 (*Smithson misc. Coll.* 73 (No. 4) : 19-30), when the Commission ruled against the availability of the *Tentamen* for nomenclatorial purposes; this decision was clarified by the Commission in 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 338) in preparation for its being entered in the Schedule to the *Règles* devoted to recording decisions of this kind.

12. But the foregoing decision on the general issue of principle involved could not in itself bring the *Tentamen* controversy to a close, for there remained

the question whether any, and, if so, which, of the *Tentamen* names had become so deeply entrenched in the literature that, in order to avoid confusion and undesirable name-changing, it would be desirable to invoke the Commission's plenary powers. Whether or not such action is necessary is a matter which can only be settled by specialists determining the generic position of each of the species cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen*; (1) Where that examination shows that one of those species is the type species of some nominal genus having an available name published later than the corresponding *Tentamen* name, it will be a matter for consideration whether that later name can be used for the genus concerned without causing confusion or alternatively whether the confusion involved would be such as to call for the use of the plenary powers to validate the *Tentamen* name concerned. (2) Where it is found that one of the nominal species cited by Hübner is not the type species of any later established nominal genus, it will be necessary to determine the genus to which on taxonomic grounds the species concerned is properly referable and, having done so, to consider whether confusion would result if the species concerned were to be referred to that genus and, if so, whether the confusion expected would be such as would justify the use of the plenary powers to validate the *Tentamen* name concerned.

13. The need for validating some of the *Tentamen* names in order to prevent confusion from arising was strongly urged by Professor Wm. T. M. Forbes (Cornell University, Ithaca) when I discussed this question with him in Washington in 1947 and his representations were reported to the Commission when it considered this matter in Paris some six months later. At the same time the Commission had under consideration an application on the lines indicated above in regard to all the species of butterflies, cited in the *Tentamen*, on the basis of which the Commission was able to conclude that there was no case for using its plenary powers to validate any of the names used in the *Tentamen* as generic names of butterflies. So far as the Sub-Order Rhopalocera is concerned, the Commission was therefore able completely to dispose of the last trace of the *Tentamen* controversy by placing the *Tentamen* names concerned on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* and by placing on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the names of the genera to which the species cited in the *Tentamen* were referable, either objectively (because they were the type species of the genera concerned) or subjectively (because they were accepted by specialists as being congeneric with the type species of those genera) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 491-496).

14. In the absence of any concrete proposals it was not possible for the International Commission similarly to dispose of the *Tentamen* problem in relation to the names used for genera of moths in that leaflet. The Commission recognised the importance of securing with as little delay as possible a settlement for the Order Heterocera similar to that which it was able to secure in respect of the Sub-Order Rhopalocera and agreed for this purpose that specialists in the Heterocera should be urged to examine the *Tentamen* from the point of view indicated in paragraph 12 above and, having done so, to submit their conclusions to the Commission for consideration. Specialists in the Heterocera

are accordingly particularly asked to assist the Commission finally to dispose of the *Tentamen* problem by submitting applications of the kind indicated above.

**(C) THREE CASES ARISING OUT OF A SUBJECT WHICH
HAS BEEN DEALT WITH INCOMPLETELY IN A
PREVIOUSLY RENDERED "OPINION"**

**Case 9 : Question whether the type species of certain nominal
genera are to be treated as having been indicated by absolute
tautonymy (question left unsettled in "Opinion" 16)**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 580-583)

15. At its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration the situation created by the inconclusive discussion in *Opinion* 16 (1910, *Smithson Publ.* 1938 : 31-39) on the question whether the type species of the long list of nominal genera there enumerated were to be regarded as having been indicated by absolute tautonymy under Rule (d) in Article 30. In the case of two only of these generic names was a decision given in *Opinion* 16. At various later dates, however, decisions had been taken by the Commission in regard to a large number of the names concerned in *Opinions* in which those names had been placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. Nevertheless, at the time of the Commission's Paris Session there still remained twenty-seven names discussed in *Opinion* 16 on which no decision had ever been taken by the Commission.

16. In order to dispose of the unsatisfactory situation disclosed above, the Commission agreed that an investigation should be undertaken as soon as possible, in conjunction with interested specialists, for the purpose of determining, as regards each of the twenty-seven generic names referred to above, (1) whether it was an available name, (2) whether the species specified in *Opinion* 16 was currently accepted as being the type species of the genus concerned and (3) if so, whether that the generic name in question was both objectively and subjectively the oldest available name for the genus concerned. Further, the Commission agreed that in every case where this investigation showed (a) that the type species of a nominal genus cited in *Opinion* 16 was the species there so specified and (b) that the name of that genus was the oldest such name available (either objectively or subjectively) for the genus concerned, the generic name in question should be placed forthwith on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. Point (b) arises only in regard to one name (*Chaos* Linnaeus, 1767), all the others being names published in 1758 and belonging to very well-known genera. Of the twenty-seven names in question to be investigated, two are the names of mammals, twenty-two are the names of birds, two are the names of fishes and one is the name of a genus of Protozoa. The names in question are set out below ;—

(a) Names of two genera of the Class Mammalia**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)275)**

17. The two names of genera of mammals which require to be investigated under the foregoing decision by the Commission are: (1) *Camelus* Linnaeus, 1758; (2) *Rhinoceros* Linnaeus, 1758.

(b) Names of twenty-two genera of the Class Aves**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)274)**

18. The twenty-two names of genera in the Class Aves which require to be investigated are all names published by Linnaeus in 1758. They are the following: (3) *Caprimulgus*; (4) *Certhia*; (5) *Charadrius*; (6) *Corvus*; (7) *Cuculus*; (8) *Fringilla*; (9) *Fulica*; (10) *Loxia*; (11) *Meleagris*; (12) *Merops*; (13) *Motacilla*; (14) *Otis*; (15) *Pavo*; (16) *Pelecanus*; (17) *Phasianus*; (18) *Scolopax*; (19) *Sterna*; (20) *Strix*; (21) *Tetrao*; (22) *Tringa*; (23) *Upupa*; (24) *Vultur*.

(c) Names of two genera of the Class Pisces**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)276)**

19. The two names of genera in the Class Pisces are: (25) *Gymnotus*; (26) *Stromateus* (both of Linnaeus, 1758).

(d) The name of one genus in the Phylum Protozoa**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)277)**

20. The nominal genus in the Phylum Protozoa, the name of which requires to be investigated is *Chaos* Linnaeus, 1767.

21. *Request to specialists*; Specialists in the foregoing groups will greatly assist the International Commission if they will be so good as to furnish, for each of the names concerned, the information specified in paragraph 16 above.

Case 10: Question of the type species of the genus "Pleuronectes" Linnaeus, 1758 (question left unsettled in "Opinion" 68)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 337)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)606)

22. When considering the incorporation into the appropriate Schedule to the *Règles* of decisions in regard to individual nomenclatorial cases taken in previously published *Opinions*, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, at its Session held in Paris in 1948, decided that the incomplete decision in regard to the nominal genus *Pleuronectes* Linnaeus, 1758, given in *Opinion* 68 (1922, *Smithson misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 1): 1-8) (which, though entitled "The type species of *Pleuronectes* Linnaeus, 1758" (Class Pisces) did not deal

with that subject at all, merely stating that a given author (Fleming) on a given occasion (1828) did not select a type species for this genus) should be supplemented as soon as possible by a further *Opinion* specifying what is the type species of this genus and placing the name of that genus on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

23. The Commission accordingly decided to invite the assistance of ichthyologists in preparing an application dealing with the foregoing subject. Advice on this subject will be greatly appreciated.

Case 11 : Question of the type species of the genus " Sparus "
Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces) (question left unsettled in
" Opinion " 69)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 337)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)607)

24. When at Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature considered *Opinion* 69 (1922, *Smithson misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 1) : 9-12), which was concerned with the generic name *Sparus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces), it placed on record its view that this *Opinion* suffered from defects similar to those noted above (paragraph 22) in connection with *Opinion* 68, that is, that, although it was entitled " The type species of *Sparus* Linnaeus, 1758," it did not in fact deal with that subject at all, merely stating that " Fleming, 1828, 211 " did not select a type species for this genus. The Commission accordingly decided that *Opinion* 69 should be supplemented as soon as possible by a further *Opinion* specifying what is the type species of this genus and placing the name of this genus on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

25. The Commission decided therefore to invite the assistance of ichthyologists in preparing an application dealing with the foregoing subject. Advice on this subject will be greatly appreciated.

(D) ONE CASE CONCERNED WITH THE NOMEN-
CLATORIAL STATUS OF A BOOK

Case 12 : Question of the nomenclatorial status of Brisson (M. J.),
1762, " Regnum Animale " (ed. 2)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 313-314)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)124)

26. The question of the status of names published in 1762 in the second edition of M. J. Brisson's *Regnum Animale* was first brought before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in an application submitted by Dr. G. H. H. Tate (American Museum of Natural History, New

York). The problem here is similar to that raised by the same author's *Ornithologia* of 1760, namely whether Brisson applied the principles of binominal nomenclature. In the case of the *Ornithologia* (a work which includes a large number of generic names in common use) the foregoing question was answered in the negative in 1948 by the Commission which, however, at the same time used its plenary powers to validate that work for nomenclatorial purposes (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 65-66). No answer has as yet been given by the Commission as regards the *Regnum animale*. If, however, that question were to be answered in a sense similar to that of the reply given as regards the *Ornithologia*, it would at once be necessary to consider which of the generic names for mammals published in the *Regnum Animale* ought to be validated under the plenary powers, if serious confusion and extensive name-changing was to be avoided. For a further discussion of the problems arising in connection with names published in 1762 in the Second Edition of Brisson's *Regnum animale*, see also paragraphs 69-72 of the present Report, where this subject is considered in relation to the generic names *Odobenus* Brisson, 1762, and *Rosmarus* Brünnich, 1771.

27. Mammalogists are accordingly particularly invited to notify to the Commission which of the generic names in Brisson's *Regnum Animale* of 1763 ought, in their view, to be preserved if it were to be found that that work does not satisfy the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25 as amended in 1948 by the Paris Congress, i.e., if it were to be ruled by the International Commission that Brisson did not consistently apply the principles of binominal nomenclature in the above work.

**(E) ONE CASE CONCERNED WITH THE RELATIVE
PRIORITY TO BE ASSIGNED TO CERTAIN BOOKS
DEALING WITH THE SAME SUBJECT AND PUBLISHED
ON UNKNOWN DATES IN THE SAME YEAR**

**Case 13 : Relative priority to be accorded to names published
for butterflies in 1775 in certain books and papers (a) by Pieter
Cramer ; (b) by J. N. C. M. Denis & Ignaz Schiffermüller ; (c)
by Johann Christian Fabricius, and (d) by S. A. von Rottemburg**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 459)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)448)

28. At its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature recommended, and the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology agreed, that there should be added to the *Règles* a provision that, where, under the Articles then agreed to be so inserted for the purpose of determining the dates of publications of books containing new zoological names (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 223-225), it was impossible to ascertain which of any two books or papers had been published, or was to be deemed to have been published, before the other, the question was to be referred to the International Commission for decision (1950, *ibid.* 4: 257). Later during the

same Session the Commission agreed to take such a decision after consultation with specialists for the purpose of settling the hitherto insoluble problem in the nomenclature of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) presented by four works, each containing new names of butterflies and moths, published in the year 1775.

29. The works in question are: (1) the eight Parts in which the first volume of Pieter Cramer's *Uitlandsche Kapellen* was published; (2) the celebrated work commonly known as the "Wiener Verzeichniss", published anonymously by J. N. C. M. Denis and Ignaz Schiffermüller under the title *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener-gegend*; (3) the well-known *Systema Entomologiae* of Johann Christian Fabricius; (4) the important paper entitled *Anmerkungen zu den Hufnagelischen Tabellen der Schmetterlinge* by S. A. von Rottensburg published in the serial publication *Naturforscher* (volume 6, pp. 1-34; vol. 7, pp. 105-112). The importance of reaching a decision on the foregoing matter is due partly to the fact that in the above works different names are published for the same species (thus raising the question of how to apply the Law of Priority) and the same names given to different species (thus raising the question of how to apply the Law of Homonymy).

30. The views of interested specialists as to the best way in which to settle the foregoing question, i.e. how to settle this question with the minimum of interference with current nomenclatorial practice, will be extremely welcome to the International Commission. Being myself an interested specialist in this particular matter, I should like tentatively to submit the following considerations:—(1) It will never be possible to establish with certainty the relative dates of publication of the foregoing works by Denis & Schiffermüller and by Fabricius and of the various parts in which the first volume of Cramer's *Uitlandsche Kapellen* and the first two instalments of Rottensburg's *Anmerkungen* were published and, therefore, until a definite decision is taken by the International Commission under the powers specially conferred upon it by the International Congress of Zoology for settling cases of this kind, it will remain impossible to stabilise the nomenclature of those species for which new names were published in two or more of the foregoing works in those cases where it is necessary to reach a conclusion as to the application of the Law of Priority or of the Law of Homonymy in relation to such names; (2) For the foregoing reasons it is highly desirable that the long-standing confusion and instability which has resulted from the impossibility of determining the relative priority to be accorded to the competing names concerned should be brought to an end by a decision by the Commission as to the relative priority to be accorded to the four works with which we are concerned. (3) Since any such decision would have to be based upon considerations other than actual dates of publication (which, as already explained, it is impossible to ascertain), it would be possible, when settling the order of relative priority to be adopted, to pay regard to other criteria of value in the determination of the species concerned. The provision I have particularly in mind is the provision of an adequately defined and sufficiently restricted type locality, this being a matter of great importance at the subspecies level in the case of polytypic species, such as are most of those with which we are here concerned. From this point of view Denis & Schiffer-

müller's *Ankündigung* stands out pre-eminently by reason of the information (provided in the title) that the species described therein were all from the "Wienergegend"; next comes Rottemburg's *Anmerkungen*, which also contains good indications in regard to type localities, accompanied in some cases by plates which (judged by the standards of the time) must be considered quite good. Judged by the foregoing standards Cramer's *Uitlandsche Kapellen* would come next, for, although the localities given refer normally to countries only and not to places, they are usually to be relied upon and are moreover supplemented by coloured plates. From every point of view the *Systema* of Fabricius is the least satisfactory of the books with which we are here concerned; it has no plates; the Latin descriptions are very brief; the citation of bibliographical references to earlier works at times adds to the difficulties of identification (at least at the subspecies level); the localities cited are lacking in precision. For the reasons summarised in (3) above, I would suggest for the consideration of my colleagues that the order of priority which would be calculated to give the most satisfactory results would be:—(a) Denis & Schiffermüller; (b) von Rottemburg; (c) Cramer; (d) Fabricius. While a settlement on the foregoing basis would, I believe, in general prove superior to any other, individual cases would, no doubt, arise where such an order of priority would give priority to the less important of some given pair of names, but this would be inevitable whatever order of priority was adopted. It is suggested, therefore, that, if this were to happen in any case where confusion would be likely to result, the situation should be remedied by invoking the use of the Commission's plenary powers.

31. It is particularly hoped that, in order that a satisfactory settlement may be reached in regard to the long-outstanding difficulty discussed above, lepidopterists will be good enough to furnish the Commission with their views as to the action which it is desirable should now be taken. It will be of great assistance if, in commenting on this problem, specialists will be so kind as to give particulars of any cases of which they may be aware (1) where the same species has been given two or more names in the books and papers here under consideration or (2) where a new name given to a species in any of the above works is a homonym of another name given to some other species in another of these works.

(F) FIFTEEN CASES RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL NAMES

Case 14 : Species to which the trivial name "annulatum" commonly treated as having been published by Dschunkowsky & Luhs in 1904 (in the combination "*Piroplasma annulatum*") (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida) is to be treated as applicable

(Sec 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 431-433)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)122)

32. The question of the species of the Order Coccidiida (Class Sporozoa) to which is applicable the trivial name *annulatum* commonly treated as having been published by Dschunkowsky & Luhs in 1904 in the combination *Piroplasma annulatum* was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. G. Witenberg (Hebrew University, Jerusalem) in an application which was published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in 1947 (Witenberg, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 223-224). In the course of preparing this application for submission to the Commission, in my capacity as Secretary to the Commission, I established that the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was not published in the paper by Dschunkowsky & Luhs which appeared in 1904 and which was always cited in the literature as the place where this name was first published. In spite of extensive correspondence with specialists on the subject, I was not able definitely to establish when and where this name was first published with an indication, though I did form an opinion as to the place where it probably first appeared. The foregoing investigations formed the subject of my Report which was published at the same time as Dr. Witenberg's application (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 234-236).

33. Dr. Witenberg's application and my Report were considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in 1948; the Commission then took a decision on the question submitted by Dr. Witenberg, but agreed to postpone for a short time rendering an *Opinion* on this subject, in the hope that further efforts might elicit information throwing light on the question of the place where the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was first published and the date on which it was first published. The publication in 1950 of the foregoing decision has not, however, brought any fresh information to light on this subject. Clearly the formal promulgation of the Commission's decision on the question submitted by Dr. Witenberg cannot be allowed much longer to be held up for the sake of investigations as to the date and place of first publication of the foregoing name. In order, however, to exhaust every possible means of obtaining information on this subject, this case is included in the present Report in the hope that there may be some protozoologist or other zoologist or some veterinary specialist who may be able to throw some additional light on this question.

Case 15 : Question whether it is desirable, in the interest of stability and to avoid confusion, to validate the generic name "Naucoris" Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) under the plenary powers

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 370)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)608)

34. When at Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature decided that in the *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* Geoffroy had not applied the principles of binominal

nomenclature, as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25 as then amended by the International Congress of Zoology (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63-66), the Commission placed on record its view that it was desirable that certain of the generic names published in the above book should be validated under the plenary powers in order to prevent the confusion which would otherwise ensue and invited myself, as its Secretary, to consult with specialists on this subject (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 366-369 and also paragraphs 9 and 10 of the present Report). In the ensuing discussion the International Commission validated forthwith one of the generic names in question (*Corixa* Geoffroy), full particulars of that case having already been submitted to it by Professor H. B. Hungerford (University of Kansas) (see 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 258-259 ; 1950, *ibid.* **4** : 369). In the same discussion the view was expressed by Professor Robert L. Usinger (an Alternate Commissioner) that similar action was desirable in the case of the generic name *Naucoris* Geoffroy, 1762. As a full statement of the facts relating to this name was not available at that time, it was decided that consideration should be given as soon as practicable after the close of the Paris Session to the question whether the foregoing generic name should be validated under the plenary powers, and, if so, what species should be selected as the type species of this nominal genus.

35. In order to give effect to the desire expressed by the Commission that the question whether the generic name *Naucoris* Geoffroy, 1762, should be preserved under the plenary powers should be settled as quickly as possible, hemipterists are invited to notify the Commission of their views on this question and on the associated question of the species to be accepted as the type species of this nominal genus if the name *Naucoris* is to be preserved.

Case 16 : Question whether " *Corixa geoffroyi* " Leach, 1817, is the oldest name, available either subjectively or objectively, for the species so named

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 369-370)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)609)

36. As already noted (paragraph 34 above) the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, when considering the problems raised by the conclusion that Geoffroy's *Histoire abrégée* of 1762 was not a binominal work, decided forthwith to use its plenary powers to validate the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762. In taking this action, it was necessary for the Commission to designate the species to be treated as the type species of this genus. In his application to the Commission on this subject, Professor H. B. Hungerford, after pointing out that some authors had accepted as the type species of this genus the nominal species *Notonecta striata* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 439) which alone had been cited by Geoffroy under the generic name *Corixa*, while others had accepted as the type species the species which had been figured by Geoffroy under the name *Corixa* but to which Geoffroy had not applied a binominal name ; later that species had been given the name *Corixa geoffroyi* by Leach in 1817 (*Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **12** (1) : 17) (Hungerford, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 258-259). Later in the same application

Professor Hungerford drew attention to the fact that Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History)) had in 1938 (*Ent. mon. Mag.* **74**: 34-39) identified the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, with that represented by the earlier nominal species *Sigara punctata* Illiger, 1807 (in *Faun. etrusc.* (ed. 2): 354). At the conclusion of his application, Professor Hungerford expressed the hope that the name *Corixa Geoffroy*, 1762, would be accepted as an available name with *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, as type species.

37. When validating the name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762, the International Commission itself designated under the plenary powers the nominal species *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, to be the type species of this genus. In view, however, of the claims which had been advanced by Dr. China that the name *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, was a subjective synonym of *Sigara punctata* Illiger, 1807, the International Commission decided to defer taking a decision on the question whether the trivial name *geoffroyi* Leach, 1817 (as published in the binominal combination *Corixa geoffroyi*) should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* until after further consideration had been given to the question whether that name is the oldest trivial name, available either objectively or subjectively, for the species in question. At the same time the Commission charged me in my capacity as Secretary to the Commission with the duty of presenting a Report on this subject as soon as the general wishes of interested specialists had been ascertained.

38. In accordance with the instructions issued by the International Congress of Zoology, the International Commission is bound in a case of this kind to place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* either (1) the trivial name *geoffroyi* Leach, 1817 (as published in the binominal combination *Corixa geoffroyi*) (as the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Corixa* Geoffroy) or (2) if, in the opinion of specialists, that trivial name is not the oldest trivial name available, either objectively or subjectively, for the species in question, whatever trivial name is so considered by specialists. If in any case it is a matter of disagreement among specialists as to whether the trivial name of the type species of a given nominal genus (in this case, the trivial name *geoffroyi* Leach) is the oldest available name for the species in question with a consequent prospect of continued instability and confusion, it would be possible for the Commission, if specialists so desired, to suppress the older and less well-known of the competing trivial names. It is on these questions that the views of hemipterists are now invited.

Case 17: Question of the trivial name to be accepted as the trivial name of the Sand Crab (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 573-580.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)271)

39. In Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature reviewed the subjects dealt with in its *Opinion* 13 (1910, *Smithson.*

Publ. 1938 : 22-24), an *Opinion* in which (in accordance with the practice of that day) no definitive decision was given, the decision reached being expressly recorded as being given "under the premises submitted." In the light of the information before it at the time of this review the International Commission cancelled *Opinion* 13 and, so far as concerns the portion of that *Opinion* which related to the question of the trivial name of the Sand Crab, ruled (1) that the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer quadratus*), a name given to the Sand Crab, was an available name, (2) that, before it decided whether or not to correct the error in regard to this matter contained in *Opinion* 13, i.e., before deciding whether to render an *Opinion* ruling that the name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787, was the oldest available such name and was therefore to be used in preference to the name *albicans* Bosc, [1801-1802] (as published in the binominal combination *Ocypoda albicans*) (the name incorrectly stated in *Opinion* 13 to be the oldest trivial name for the Sand Crab), interested specialists should be consulted on the question whether instability and confusion would be likely to ensue if the decision taken in 1910 in the foregoing *Opinion* were now to be reversed by the adoption of the name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787, as the name for the Sand Crab. The Commission further decided that, if specialists were of the opinion that the foregoing results would accrue, the plenary powers should be used to suppress the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius and to validate the trivial name *albicans* Bosc, but that, if specialists were of the opinion that the foregoing adverse results were not to be expected, the trivial name *quadratus* Fabricius, 1787, should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

40. The views of interested carcinologists are particularly requested as to the relative advantages of the two courses set out above, in order that, this aspect of the question having been settled, an *Opinion* may be rendered in accordance with the decision taken by the International Commission at its Paris Session.

**Case 18 : Question of the relative status of the generic names
"Acmea" Hartmann, 1821, and "Acmaea" Eschscholtz, 1833
(Class Gastropoda)**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 389-392.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)27)

41. At its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration an application submitted by Mrs. Avery R. Test (formerly Avery R. Grant) (University of California) on the subject of the relative status of the generic names *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833 (Class Gastropoda) from the point of view of the Law of Homonymy. Subsequent to the receipt of Mrs. Test's application but prior to the Paris Session of the Commission, a detailed communication in regard to this case had been received from Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California), from which it became clear that, contrary to the view expressed by Mrs. Test in her application and by other authors who had previously discussed this matter, the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, was not

an emendation by Hartman of the name *Acme* published by Hartmann in the same volume (and in the same year), but was the name given by that author to a separately established nominal genus, having the nominal species *Acmea truncata* Hartmann, 1821, as its type species (by selection by Iredale in 1915), whereas the nominal genus *Acme* Hartmann, 1821, had as its type species the nominal species *Bulimus lineatus* Draparnaud, 1801 (by monotypy).

42. In the consideration of this case the International Commission took the view (1) that it was likely that there would be continued confusion if two such similar words as *Acmea* and *Acmaea* were to be used as the names of genera within a single Class (Class Gastropoda) and (2) that great confusion would arise from the substitution of the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, for the well-known and widely used name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826 (the name of a nominal genus having as its type species a nominal species (*Truncatella laevigata* Risso, 1821) which is subjectively identified with *Cyclostoma truncatulum* Draparnaud, 1801, with which also is synonymised *Acmea truncata* Hartmann, 1821, the name of the nominal species which is the type species of *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821). The Commission accordingly decided to put before specialists for consideration the suggestion that the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, should be suppressed under the plenary powers, thus simultaneously removing the risk of confusion arising from the concurrent use in the Class Gastropoda of the words *Acmea* and *Acmaea* as generic names and providing a valid basis for the continued use of the generic name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826. The Commission further ruled that, pending the proposed consultation with specialists, the name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, was not to be replaced by the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, the whole problem to be regarded as being *sub judice*.

43. It is desired by the Commission that a definite decision on this case, which for so long has been a cause of difficulty and confusion, should be reached with as little further delay as possible. Specialists are therefore particularly asked to furnish the Commission as quickly as possible with their comments on the Commission's suggestion, as set out in the preceding paragraph.

Case 19 : Question of the relative advantages of using the generic names "Petalifera" Gray, 1847, and "Aplysiella" Fischer, 1872 (Class Gastropoda) for the genus so named

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 387-389.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)150)

44. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in 1948 had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. H. Engel (Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam) for a ruling on the question whether the generic name *Petalifera* Gray, 1847 (Class Gastropoda) was an available name (with *Aplysia petalifera* Rang, 1828, as type species, by absolute tautonymy) and should therefore be used in preference to the name *Aplysiella*

Fischer, 1872. In the discussion which ensued it was pointed out that, as the name *Petalifera* Gray had been published as a synonym of the name *Dolabrifera* (a name first published on the same occasion), the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of the nominal genus *Petalifera* was one which could not appropriately be determined, pending the outcome of the inquiry which the Commission had already agreed (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 351-352) should be undertaken.* At the same time the Commission gave consideration to the question whether, if ultimately the name *Petalifera* Gray were found to be an available name, its use in place of the name *Aplysiella* Fischer would be likely to give rise to confusion; it was explained that, as the present was one of the oldest of the applications awaiting attention, it was possible that, although the name *Aplysiella* Fischer was, it appeared, the name generally used at the time when this application had been submitted, the practice of specialists in this matter might have changed during the intervening period. This was a matter on which, it was generally felt, it was desirable to obtain an up-to-date statement.

45. The International Commission accordingly agreed that, without prejudice to the general question whether a name published in the manner in which Gray had published the name *Petalifera* and in anticipation of the decision on the general question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published as a synonym of some other generic name, steps should be taken to ascertain from specialists whether the substitution of the name *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, for the name *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, if that were found to be required under the *Règles*, would be likely to give rise to confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned. This is the question on which the views of specialists are therefore now invited.

Case 20 and Case 21 : Future status to be accorded to the trivial names "fasciata" Poiret, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination "Aplysia fasciata") and "punctata" Cuvier, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination "Aplysia punctata") (Class Gastropoda)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 301-304)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)610 ("fasciata") and 611 ("punctata"))

46. At its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. H. Engel (Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam) for the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of determining the future use of the generic names *Tethys* and *Aplysia*, each of which had been used by some authors for a well-known genus of Tectibranchs and by other authors for an equally well-known genus of Nudibranchs. All cases of this kind turn upon what species should under the *Règles* be recognised as the type species of the nominal genus concerned. The present case is greatly complicated however by doubts regarding the taxo-

*See pp. 109-118 of the present Volume

nomie species represented by the various nominal species concerned and by the existence of several nominal species which are either unrecognisable or bear trivial names which, despite their undoubted rights under the Law of Priority, are not in use and have virtually never been used. The present problem was originally brought to the attention of the International Commission by the inclusion of the names in question in the list of suggested *nomina conservanda* brought forward by the late Commissioner Karl Apstein (Berlin) but rejected by the Commission on the ground that the plenary powers could not be used for validating long lists of names submitted *en bloc*, it being necessary to submit each such case individually with adequate supporting data (see *Opinion 74*, published in 1922, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 1) : 32-34). Later, the names were in fact so submitted by Dr. Engel but, as at that time the Commission possessed no means of giving publicity for so long a paper as that prepared by Dr. Engel, it was arranged that as a first step that paper should be published elsewhere. Under this arrangement Dr. Engel's application was published under the title "On the names of the genera *Tethys* and *Aplysia*" in 1936 (Engel, 1936, *Temminckia* **1** : 221-266). In that application Dr. Engel submitted proposals, involving an extensive use of the plenary powers; these proposals dealt with (1) the stabilisation of the names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* and the designation, as the respective type species of those genera, of species in harmony with current usage, and (2) the determination of the trivial names to be used for the three Tectibranch species and the one Nudibranch species involved in this complex problem. The greater part of the subject dealt with in Dr. Engel's application formed the subject of decisions taken by the International Commission at its Paris Session, but two of the constituent problems were then left over for further consideration. The purpose of the present note is to draw the attention of interested specialists to the two problems which the Commission at Paris referred back for further consideration, and, in accordance with the decision taken in Paris, to seek the views of specialists as to the solution which it is desirable should be adopted in regard to these names.

47. The history of the names given to, and used by later authors for, each of the four species (three Tectibranchs and one Nudibranch) involved in the *Tethys/Aplysia* problem is set out in great detail in Dr. Engel's *Temminckia* paper, to which reference is necessary for the purpose of examining the full bibliographical history of the two names with which the present inquiry is concerned. We have first to note that in Paris the International Commission used its plenary powers for the purpose of determining the name to be used for the first of the three Tectibranch species dealt with in Dr. Engel's paper (which we may conveniently refer to as Species T.1) and for the Nudibranch species (here called species N.1). Under that decision the name *Aplysia depilans* Gmelin, 1791, became the correct name for species T.1, the species so named becoming the type species of the genus *Aplysia* Linnaeus, 1767, while the name *Tethys fimbria* Linnaeus, 1767, became the correct name for species N.1, the species so named becoming the type species of the genus *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767 (the name *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1758, being at the same time suppressed under the plenary powers). The two species, the names for which were left over for further consideration were the species T.2 and the species T.3. It is the names to be used for these species that the present Report is concerned to

ascertain. The data submitted to the Commission on this subject are briefly summarised in the following paragraphs.

48. *The name to be used for the Tectibranch species "T.2":* Dr. Engel pointed out in his application (: 246) that the nominal species *Aplysia depilans* Linnaeus, 1767, was, when its name was first published, a nominal species comprising both species T.1 and species T.2. The existence of species T.2, as a species, distinct from species T.1, was however recognised by Poirét, who in 1789 applied to it the name *Lapylsia* [recte *Aplysia*] *fasciata* (Poirét, 1789, *Voy. Barbarie* 2:2). In the following year Gmelin (1790, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) 1:3103) adopted the trivial name *fasciata* Poirét, 1789, for species T.2, while (on the same page) applying the trivial name *depilans* Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Lapylsia depilans*) exclusively to species T.1. Gmelin's treatment of the trivial name *depilans* Linnaeus as the name for species T.1 was, Dr. Engel noted (: 246), followed by all subsequent authors (in 111 publications at the time when Dr. Engel's application was written); but there was unfortunately no such unanimity in the subsequent practice followed as to the name to be applied to species T.2. From the full particulars given by Dr. Engel (: 245-246) it appears that in the period from 1790 up to the date on which Dr. Engel's application was compiled (a period of about 145 years) there are 116 references to species T.2 in the literature; in these this species was referred to under the trivial name *fasciata* Poirét 1789, on sixty-one occasions, was misidentified as *limacina* Linnaeus, 1758 (i.e. the nominal species *Tethys limacina* Linnaeus, 1758) on fifty-one occasions; and was identified on four occasions with *Tethys leporina* Linnaeus, 1758, and therefore called by the trivial name *leporina*. Elsewhere in his application (: 246-247) Dr. Engel drew attention to the large number of occasions on which the trivial name *leporina* Linnaeus, 1758, had been applied to the Nudibranch species N.1, and asked that, in view of the confusion which would attend the continued use of that trivial, the International Commission should use its plenary powers to suppress it. Dr. Engel concluded therefore that the trivial name *fasciata* Poirét, 1789, which had been used for species T.2 by the majority of the authors who had published papers dealing with the species concerned (61 references as against 55 papers in which either the name *limacina* or the name *leporina* had been used), was the oldest available trivial name, and the most widely used trivial name, for this species. Dr. Engel accordingly asked the International Commission formally to recognise the trivial name *fasciata* Poirét, 1789, as the correct name for species.

49. *The name to be used for the Tectibranch species "T.3":* Dr. Engel pointed out (: 246) that, as first noted by Odhner (in 1907), the oldest available name for species T.3 was *Aplysia rosea* Rathke, 1799 (*Skr. Nat. Selsk.* 5(1): [85], 147) but that the great majority of subsequent authors (92 papers) had used the name *Lapylsia punctata* Cuvier, 1803 (*Ann. Mus. Hist. nat.*, Paris 2(10): 310); Dr. Engel added that there were some trivial names of later date which were subjective synonyms of *punctata* Cuvier but these had been used by only a few authors and had been dropped as soon as their synonymy with *punctata* Cuvier had been established. Dr. Engel accordingly asked for an *Opinion*

prescribing the use of the name *punctata* Cuvier in place of the name *rosea* Rathke as the trivial name of species T.3.

50. Questions put to specialists for advice ; When we compare the position as regards the names *Laplysia* [recte *Aplysia*] *fasciata* Poiret, 1789, and *Aplysia punctata* Cuvier, 1804 ; as submitted to the International Commission by Dr. Engel (as summarised in paragraphs 48 and 49 above) with the decisions taken by the Commission at its Paris Session (1950, *loc. cit.* 4 : 303), we find : (1) that the decisions then taken to suppress all uses of the trivial names *leporina* and *limacina* in the genus *Tethys* leave the trivial name *fasciata* Poiret, 1789 (as published in the combination *Laplysia* [sic] *fasciata*) as indisputably the oldest available name for the species T.2 ; (2) that none of the decisions taken in Paris have any bearing on the status to be accorded to the trivial name *punctata* Cuvier, 1803, in relation to the species T.3. On the basis of the information supplied by Dr. Engel there appears to be strong grounds in favour of the use of the plenary powers (as proposed in the application) for the purpose of suppressing the long-neglected (and not currently used) trivial name *rosea* Rathke, 1799 (as published in the combination *Aplysia rosea*), thereby making the trivial name *punctata* Cuvier, 1804 (as published in the combination *Aplysia* [sic] *punctata*) the name which is currently applied to the species T.3 and which has been almost consistently so applied ever since 1803, the oldest trivial name available, either subjectively or objectively, for that species. To sum up (a) there no longer seems to be any point of substance to put to specialists as regards the trivial name to be used for the species T.2 and the question now put to specialists is therefore whether there is any reason not so far brought to light why the trivial name *fasciata* Poiret, 1789, should not now be stabilised as correct trivial name for the species T.2 by being placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ; (b) as regards the species T.3, the question now put to specialists is whether it is desirable that the trivial name *rosea* Rathke, 1799, should be suppressed under the plenary powers, in order to render the customary name *punctata* Cuvier, 1803, the oldest available name for the species T.3.

Case 22 : Question of the status to be accorded to the generic name " Ammonia " Brünnich, 1771 (Class Cephalopoda or Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 313)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)612)

51. When (as explained in paragraph 8 of the present Report) the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ruled in Paris in 1948 that in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta* of 1771 Brünnich had applied the principles of binominal nomenclature and therefore that new names published in that work possessed rights under the Law of Priority it gave preliminary consideration to the status to be accorded to the new names concerned. One of these names was *Ammonia* Brünnich, 1771 (*Zool. Fund.* : 246), and it is as regards the treatment to be accorded to this name that the advice of specialists (in the Cephalopoda and Foraminifera) are now sought.

52. In the original application submitted to the International Commission in regard to the status of names in Brünnich's *Fundamenta*, the late Mr. R. Winckworth (1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 116) gave his reasons for considering that the species eligible for selection as the type species of *Ammonia* Brünnich were (a) *Nautilus spirula* Linnaeus, 1758, and (b) *Nautilus beccarii* Linnaeus, 1758. These being the first nominal species to be placed in the genus *Ammonia* Brünnich, are, under the decision taken in 1948 by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology when codifying the ruling given in the Commission's *Opinion* 46 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 159-160, 346), the only nominal species eligible for selection as the type species of *Ammonia* Brünnich. As Mr. Winckworth pointed out, the selection of *Nautilus spirula* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus would inevitably cause great confusion, for it would involve the sinking of the extremely well known name *Spirula* Lamarck, 1799, as a synonym of the name *Ammonia* Brünnich, 1771, a name never used till now since its publication in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta* 180 years ago. Few, if any, specialists will dispute the view expressed by Mr. Winckworth that, rather than permit this to happen, the International Commission should use its plenary powers to suppress the name *Ammonia* Brünnich. The only alternative would, as pointed out by Mr. Winckworth, be to select *Nautilus beccarii* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus. Such action would inevitably mean the displacement of some later generic name in the Order Foraminifera, but no information is as yet available to the Commission as to the extent to which such a displacement would be open to objection.

53. There are thus two questions on which the advice of specialists is desired : (1) *Workers in the Class Cephalopoda* are asked to state their view on the question whether, in order to save the name *Spirula* Lamarck, 1799, it would be desirable to suppress the name *Ammonia* Brünnich, 1771, under the plenary powers if *Nautilus spirula* Linnaeus, 1758, were to be selected as the type species of Brünnich's genus. (2) *Workers in the Order Foraminifera* are asked to inform the Commission (a) in what genus the nominal species *Nautilus beccarii* Linnaeus, 1758, is currently placed, and (b) whether confusion would be likely to result if it were necessary to sink the name of that genus (whatever it may be) as a synonym of *Ammonia* Brünnich, 1771, through the nominal species *Nautilus beccarii* being selected as the type species of that genus.

**Case 23 : The status to be accorded to the generic name
"Encrinus" Schulze, 1760, and the species to be accepted as its
type species (Class Crinoidea)**

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 509-513)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)434)

54. During its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. Th. Mortensen (Copenhagen) for the validation of the generic name *Encrinus* Schulze, 1760, with *Encrinus liliiformis* Lamarck, 1801, as its type species (Class Crinoidea). This problem in 1909 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (8)**4** :

37-42) had been discussed by the late Commissioner F. A. Bather. Later, it had been the subject of consultation between thirty-eight leading echinologists in all parts of the world prior to its being submitted to the Commission; as the result of this consultation thirty-four of the specialists in question gave their support for the foregoing proposal, one abstained, and three did not answer. Full particulars regarding this consultation were published in 1932 (Mortensen, 1932, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10)10: 345-348). Later in the same year the present application was submitted to the Commission. Thus, at the time of the submission of this proposal, it enjoyed an overwhelming measure of support from the active workers in this group. Various circumstances made it impossible for the Commission to deal with this application prior to the outbreak of the World War in 1939, and in consequence it was not until its Paris Session that the Commission was able to take this proposal into consideration. By that date sixteen years had elapsed since the original submission of this application; the Commission accordingly took the view that, before a decision was taken on this application, it was desirable to ascertain from specialists whether any developments had occurred in regard to the usage of this name during the foregoing period which might affect the nature of the action which it was desirable should be taken.

55. In accordance with the foregoing decision, specialists in the Echinodermata, including those who took part in the consultation organised by Dr. Mortensen prior to the original submission of this application to the Commission, are requested to be so kind as to notify the Commission as soon as possible of their attitude to the proposal that the International Commission should now use its plenary powers to validate the generic name *Encrinus* Schulze, 1760, and to designate *Encrinus liliiformis* Lamarck, 1801, as its type species.

Case 24 : Proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name "Echinocrinus" Agassiz, 1841, and to validate the name "Archaeocidaris" McCoy, 1844 (Class Echinoidea)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 514-516)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)320)

56. The proposal that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, for the purpose of validating the name *Archaeocidaris* McCoy, 1844 (Class Echinoidea) was one of seven cases submitted to the Commission by Dr. Th. Mortensen in 1932 jointly with that of *Encrinus* Schulze, 1760, discussed in paragraphs 54-55 above. As in the case of the name *Encrinus*, an extensive consultation between leading specialists in different parts of the world had taken place in regard to the proposed validation of the name *Archaeocidaris* McCoy, prior to the application in regard to that name being submitted to the Commission. Of the thirty-eight specialists who took part in that consultation thirty-five had supported the submission of this application to the Commission, one had expressed the view that *Archaeocidaris* McCoy,

1844, could be used without invoking the use of the plenary powers, while two had voted against the proposal on grounds unconnected with the merits of this particular case (see Mortensen, 1932, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) **10** : 345). As in the case of the name *Encrinus*, the Commission did not find it possible to deal with this proposal before the outbreak of the World War in 1939. After the close of that war, this application was advertised in 1947 in the serial publications "Science" and "Nature" as a case involving the possible use of the plenary powers. No objection to the action proposed was elicited as the result of this advertisement.

57. When the International Commission considered this application at its Session held in Paris in July, 1948, it took the view that a further consultation with specialists regarding the nature and extent of the confusion to be expected if the name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz were to be substituted for the name *Archaeocidaris* McCoy was desirable before a decision was reached on this application. In the original application to the Commission the thirty-five specialists who had joined in submitting this application had based their proposal on two grounds: (1) The name *Echinocrinus* had been given by Agassiz to the genus concerned in the mistaken belief that the fossil species included in it were crinoids; once it was established that these species were in fact Echinoids, the name *Echinocrinus* had become "absolutely misleading" and it was for this reason that this name had been dropped in favour of the thoroughly appropriate name *Archaeocidaris* McCoy; (2) All the main authorities who had published on this genus (Desor, Zittel, Jackson, Lambert & Thierry, Mortensen) had used the name *Archaeocidaris* and on this account also the substitution for that name of the name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz would be calculated to cause confusion. Of the foregoing arguments, clearly (1) remains as valid today as at the time when it was first advanced. Argument (2) would, however, have been impaired in its force if it could be shown that in the period 1932-1951 leading authorities had published important works in which they had used the name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz in place of the name *Archaeocidaris* McCoy, particularly if it could be shown that any of those authors who regarded this genus as the type genus of a family had changed the name of that family from ARCHAEOCIDARIDAE to ECHINOCRINIDAE.

58. In order that a final decision may be taken by the International Commission on this application with as little further delay as possible, specialists in the Echinoida, including those specialists who took part in submitting the original application, are requested to be so kind as to notify to the Commission their views on the questions set out in the preceding paragraph in regard to the proposal that the plenary powers should be used to validate the use of the generic name *Archaeocidaris* McCoy, 1844, in place of the name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841.

Case 25 : On the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name "Protoechinus" Austin, 1860, for the purpose of validating the name "Pholidocidaris" Meek & Worthen, 1869 (Class Echinoidea)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 513.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)435)

59. The eighth of the nine applications for the use of the plenary powers in relation to generic names in the Class Echinoidea submitted to the International Commission in 1932 by Dr. Th. Mortensen (Copenhagen) after extensive consultation with Echinoid specialists was a request that the Commission should use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Protoechinus* Austin, 1860 (type species, by monotypy : *Protoechinus anceps* Austin, 1860) for the purpose of rendering available for this genus the name *Pholidocidaris* Meek and Worthen, 1869 (type species, by monotypy : *Lepidocentrus irregularis* Meek and Worthen, 1869). The point on which this application turned was at the time a novel one, namely whether a specific name could properly be brought into use, when the original published description was insufficient to permit of the identification of the species so named but where the holotype (or other type material) on which the nominal species in question was based was still available and it was in consequence possible to establish the identity of the species in question. In this particular case, the holotype of the nominal species *Protoechinus anceps* Austin was preserved and proved on examination by Bather (1918) to be a species of the genus which in 1869 Meek & Worthen had named *Pholidocidaris*, a name which in the intervening half century had become thoroughly established. It was for this reason that the thirty-one specialists by whom the application was submitted (see Mortensen, 1932, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10)10 : 365-368) recommended the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing *Protoechinus* Austin, 1860, and validating *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen, 1869.

60. Prior to the Session of the Commission held in Paris in 1948 Dr. Mortensen intimated that, in view of the greater importance which he attached to certain of the other applications submitted to the Commission concurrently with the present application, he was disposed to discontinue the application submitted in the present case. The Commission took the view, however, that, having regard to the wide publicity which had been given (through the publication in 1932 of the paper by Dr. Mortensen entitled "A Vote on some Echinoderm Names" referred to in paragraph 59 above) to the proposal that the plenary powers should be used in this case, it would not be appropriate to allow this application to lapse, the proper course in the case of an abandoned application for the use of the plenary powers being to place on the relevant *Official List* the names which in the abandoned application it had been asked should be suppressed under the plenary powers. Moreover, in the present case it had not then been possible to ascertain from the other specialists by whom the application had originally been submitted jointly with Dr. Mortensen whether it was their desire that the application should proceed as originally proposed. The Commission accordingly asked me to consult with the original

signatories to the present application and with other specialists in the Echinoidea as to which of the two possible courses it was desirable to adopt in this case.

61. Specialists in the Echinoidea are accordingly asked to notify the Commission as soon as possible as to which of the two following alternative courses they favour in the present case : *Course (1)*. Under this course (which is that embodied in the original application) the name *Protoechinus* Austin, 1860, would be suppressed under the plenary powers and placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*, while the name *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen, 1869 (type species, by monotypy : *Lepidocentrus irregularis* Meek & Worthen, 1869) would be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. *Course (2)*. Under this course the original proposal would be abandoned, this decision being marked by the placing on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the generic name *Protoechinus* Austin, 1860 (type species, by monotypy : *Protoechinus anceps* Austin, 1860). At the species name level the adoption of *Course (1)* would involve placing the trivial name *irregularis* Meek & Worthen, 1869 (as published in the combination *Lepidocentrus irregularis*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, while *Course (2)* would involve placing on the foregoing *Official List* the trivial name *anceps* Austin, 1860 (as published in the combination *Protoechinus*), the species so named to be identified by reference to Bather's paper of 1918 ; in each case, the foregoing action would be subject to the Commission being satisfied that the trivial name concerned is subjectively as well as objectively, the oldest available such name for the species concerned ; if in either case specialists were to consider that there was some older trivial name subjectively applicable to the taxonomic species concerned, it would be that older name and not the trivial name of the nominal species which is the type species of the genus in question which would be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

Case 26 : On the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic names "Eriechinus" Pomel, 1883, and "Typhlechinus" Neumayr, 1889, for the purpose of validating the name "Lovenechinus" Jackson, 1912 (Class Echinoidea)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 513)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)613)

62. Another application submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1932 by Dr. Th. Mortensen (Copenhagen) on his own behalf and that of a large group of specialists in the Echinoidea at the same time as the application regarding the name *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen 1869, discussed in paragraphs 59-61 above, was an application asking for the use by the Commission of its plenary powers to suppress the generic names *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883, and *Typhlechinus* Neumayr, 1889, for the purpose of validating the name *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912. According to the application submitted by Dr. Mortensen and the thirty other specialists concerned (Mortensen, 1932, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10)**10** : 365-368), the relevant facts of this

case are as follows: (1) Pomel in 1883 established a nominal genus to which he applied the name *Eriechinus* and of which he designated *Palaeechinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844, as the type species; Pomel interpreted McCoy's *sphaericus* in the manner adopted by de Koninck in 1869. (2) Neumayr in 1889, being unaware of Pomel's (1883) action in establishing the nominal genus *Eriechinus*, himself established a nominal genus for the species which de Koninck (1869) had identified with *Palaeechinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844, giving the name *Typhlechinus* to the new nominal genus so established. (3) In 1912 Jackson took the line that, as the nominal genera *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883, and *Typhlechinus* Neumayr, 1889, were based upon erroneous observations and on an erroneous identification, these two generic names were "out of court as generic names." On the basis of this patently defective argument Jackson proceeded to erect the nominal genus *Lovenechinus* (with *Oligoporus missouriensis* Jackson, 1896, as type species). The applicants noted also that, prior to the publication of the name *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912, Bather had published the results of a re-examination of the specimen which de Koninck (1869) had identified as *Palaeechinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844 (i.e. the specimen which Pomel (1883) and Neumayr (1889) had similarly identified when those authors respectively established the nominal genera *Eriechinus* and *Typhlechinus*); according to Bather's examination the specimen in question was referable not to *Palaeechinus sphaericus* McCoy (as de Koninck, Pomel and Neumayr had erroneously supposed) but to the species *Palaeechinus lacazei* Julien, 1896. In submitting this case to the Commission, the applicants accordingly considered the latter species to be the type species both of *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883, and of *Typhlechinus* Neumayr, 1889; the applicants stated also that this species was, in their view, congeneric with *Oligoporus missouriensis* Jackson, 1912, the undoubted type species of *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912. According to this view, the name *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912, was a subjective junior synonym both of *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883, and of *Typhlechinus* Neumayr, 1889. While fully accepting the validity of this conclusion, the applicants took the stand that "nothing at all would be gained by reintroducing" the older but little known name *Eriechinus* Pomel instead of the name *Lovenechinus* Jackson by which the genus concerned was referred to in the main literature of the group. Speaking of this case and that of *Pholidocidaris* (discussed in paragraphs 59-61 above), the applicants added: "On the contrary, introducing these older names would only result in trouble and further confusion." The applicants accordingly asked the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to validate the name *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912, with *Oligoporus missouriensis* Jackson, 1896, as type species.

63. Prior to the Session of the Commission held in Paris in 1942 Dr. Mortensen had intimated that, in view of the greater importance which he attached to certain of the other applications submitted to the Commission concurrently with the present application, he was disposed to discontinue the application submitted in the present case. In these circumstances the Commission did not examine the present application in detail; they took the view however that, having regard to the wide publicity which had been given (through the publication in 1932 of the paper by Dr. Mortensen entitled "A

Vote on some Echinoderm Names" referred to in paragraph 62 above) to the proposal that the plenary powers should be used in the present case, it would not be appropriate to allow the present application to lapse. The Commission accordingly decided that this case should be dealt with in the same manner as that which it had been agreed to adopt in regard to the name *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen, 1869, that is, that either (1) the application should be granted and the names thus suppressed placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*, the name *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912, being at the same time placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, or (2) the application should be rejected, the accepted name being placed on the *Official List* and names found to be objective junior synonyms on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names*. The Commission accordingly invited me, as its Secretary, to take up this case with specialists for the purpose of ascertaining the general wishes of echinologists in this matter.

64. As a preliminary to discharging the duty so entrusted to me, I re-examined the application submitted by Dr. Mortensen and his colleagues for the purpose of making sure that it was not affected by any of the decisions in regard to the *Règles* taken by the International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948. This examination showed at once that the situation was materially different in one important respect from that which the applicants had believed it to be when in 1932 they submitted this application to the Commission. It will be seen from the summary of this application given in paragraph 62 above that the basis of the case submitted was the belief that the generic name *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912 (the name which it was the object of the applicants to preserve) was invalid because the type species of the genus so named was subjectively congeneric not with the nominal species *Palaeochinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844, the sole species cited by Pomel in 1883 when erecting the nominal genus *Eriechinus* and by Neumayr in 1889 when erecting the nominal genus *Typhlechinus* but with the species which, in the opinion of the applicants, Pomel and Neumayr had each been misled by the previous action of de Koninck in 1869 into misidentifying with that species. In other words, the case put forward by the applicants was that the nominal genus *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883, and the objectively identical nominal genus *Typhlechinus* Neumayr, 1869, were both genera based upon misidentified type species and that, on the assumption that the type species of both those genera was the nominal species to which Pomel and Neumayr respectively had intended to refer and not the nominal species to which they did actually refer, the generic name *Lovenechinus* Jackson, was a subjective junior synonym of the generic names *Eriechinus* Pomel and *Typhlechinus* Neumayr.

65. At the time when the present application was submitted to the Commission the only guidance available to specialists as to the treatment to be accorded to the names of genera based upon misidentified type species was that afforded by the Commission's *Opinion* 65 (1924, *Smithson. Publ.* **2256** : 152-169), in which the Commission had given a ruling which implied that in the case of a genus falling in the foregoing class it was the nominal species actually cited which was normally to be accepted as the type species; the same subject was dealt with by the Commission at its Session held in Lisbon in 1935, the decision

then reached being later embodied in *Opinion* 168 (1945, *Opinions Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* **2**: 411-430). In that *Opinion* the general principle laid down in *Opinion* 65 was amplified and confirmed but the central issue, that is, what species should be accepted as the type species of a genus which specialists agreed was based upon a misidentified type species, still remained unsettled. This important question was considered exhaustively by the International Commission when in Paris it had under consideration the recommendation to be submitted to the International Congress of Zoology for the clarification of the rulings given in the foregoing *Opinions* as a preliminary to the incorporation of those rulings, so clarified, into the *Règles* themselves. The Commission then agreed to recommend (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 158-159) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* providing (1) that, subject to (2) below, the nominal species designated or indicated as the type species of a nominal genus at the time when the generic name in question is first published or, where no such species was either so designated or indicated by the original author, the species later selected to be the type species, is to be deemed to have been correctly identified by the original author of the generic name, but (2) that, where there are grounds for considering that the species in question had in fact been misidentified by the original author the case in question is to be submitted to the International Commission. On receiving such a case, the Commission, if satisfied that such a misidentification had occurred, is to use its plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus either the species intended by the original author, when citing the name of the erroneously determined species, or, if the identity of that species is doubtful, a species in harmony with current nomenclatorial usage, except where the Commission is of the opinion that such a use of the plenary powers would result in greater confusion than uniformity. The recommendation so submitted by the International Commission was subsequently approved by the International Congress of Zoology. It is therefore in the light of the foregoing provision that the problem raised by the present application must be judged.

66. It is immediately evident that the problem now to be considered is totally different from that envisaged in the application submitted to the Commission: (1) It is the species to which the name *Palaeochinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844, properly applies which would be the type species of *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883 (and, therefore, also of *Typhlechinus* Neumayr, 1889) if it were not for the evidence brought forward by Dr. Mortensen and his colleagues that, following de Koninck (1869) Pomel (1883) and Neumayr (1889) misidentified the species to which they applied the *Palaeochinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844, the species so misidentified being *Palaeochinus lucazei* Julien, 1896. (2) In view of the foregoing evidence of misidentification it is obligatory under the *Règles* that the question of the species to be recognised as the type species of *Eriechinus* Pomel (and *Typhlechinus* Neumayr) should be submitted to the International Commission for decision and on the submission of such an application it becomes the duty of the Commission to settle the above question. (3) If the Commission were to be satisfied that Pomel and Neumayr had each misidentified *Palaeochinus lucazei* Julien as *Palaeochinus sphaericus* McCoy, it would then be the duty of the Commission to use its plenary powers to designate *Palaeochinus lucazei* Julien to be the type species of both *Eriechinus*

Pomel, 1883, and of *Typhlechinus* Neumayr, 1889, unless it was satisfied that the designation of that species to be the type species of those genera would lead to confusion. But it was the whole point of the application submitted by Dr. Mortensen and his colleagues that it would be confusing to accept the above species as the type species of these genera (because to do so would make *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912, a subjective junior synonym of the above generic names) and it was for this reason that the foregoing applicants asked the Commission to suppress the above two generic names. If the Commission were to accept the view that it would be confusing to recognise *Palaeochinus lucazei* Julien as the type species of *Eriechinus* Pomel (and *Typhlechinus* Neumayr), the only other species which it would be possible for it to designate as the type species of these genera would be the true *Palaeochinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844. According however to the application submitted to the Commission, the above species was then treated by specialists as belonging to another genus, namely *Maccoya* Pomel, 1883. If this is the taxonomic view still held by specialists, the position would be that *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883, and *Maccoya* Pomel, 1883, are no more than different names for the same genus; both were published in the same work on the same date and, as *Eriechinus* has page precedence over *Maccoya*, it would replace that name, unless the Commission were to take steps to prevent this from happening.

67. It will be seen from the foregoing analysis first that the problem involved in the present case is one which can be resolved only by obtaining a decision from the Commission; second, that it would still be necessary to invoke the use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic names *Eriechinus* Pomel and *Typhlechinus* Neumayr unless it were felt that there would be no objection to the name *Eriechinus* Pomel replacing either (a) the name *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912 (which it was the purpose of the present application to avoid) or (b) the name *Maccoya* Pomel, 1883, a contingency which was not considered in the application submitted to the Commission.

68. In these circumstances, the questions on which the advice of interested specialists is sought are: (1) Would it be confusing to accept the true *Palaeochinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844, as the type species of *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883? If so, would the confusion be such as to call for the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the name *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883? (2) Would it be confusing to accept *Palaeochinus lucazei* Julien, 1896, as the type species of the genus *Eriechinus* Pomel (and of the genus *Typhlechinus* Neumayr)? If so, would the confusion be such as to call for the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing both the foregoing generic names? (3) If it is considered that neither of the foregoing results would lead to sufficient confusion to call for the use of the plenary powers, which of the only two remaining courses of action open to the Commission would be preferred (a) the designation by the Commission of *Palaeochinus sphaericus* McCoy, 1844, to be the type species of *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883 (which, according to the information furnished in the application, would lead to *Maccoya* Pomel, 1883, falling as a junior synonym of *Eriechinus* Pomel, 1883), or (b) the designation by the Commission of *Palaeochinus lucazei* Julien, 1896, to be the type species of *Eriechinus* Pomel (in which case, according to the information furnished in the application,

Lovenechinus Jackson, 1912, would fall as a subjective junior synonym of *Erichinus* Pomel, 1883)?

Case 27 : Question of the future status to be accorded to the generic name "Rosmarus" Brünnich, 1771 (Class Mammalia)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 313)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)614)

69. As already explained (in paragraphs 51-53 above, in the question put to specialists in regard to the future status which it is desirable should be accorded to the generic name *Anemonia* Brünnich, 1771, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature decided that an inquiry should be made regarding the wishes of specialists concerning the status to be accorded to each of the new names published in 1771 in Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*. The name which has now to be considered under this decision is the name *Rosmarus* Brünnich, 1771.

70. The late Mr. R. Winckworth, by whom the application for a ruling as to the availability of new generic names published in the foregoing work was submitted to the International Commission, noted (Winckworth, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 115) that the nominal genus *Rosmarus* Brünnich had been established for *Trichechus rosmarus* Linnaeus, 1766 (= *Phoca rosmarus* Linnaeus, 1758). Actually, that species had been specified as the type species of this genus by Palmer as far back as 1904 (*N. Amer. Fauna* 23 : 612). We have here, however, to recall that the same species is the type species of the older nominal genus *Odobenus* Brisson, 1762, having been so selected by Merriam, 1895 (*Science* (n.s.) 1(14) : 375). If the name *Odobenus* Brisson, 1762, were unquestionably an available name, the name *Rosmarus* Brünnich, 1771, would be an objective junior synonym, and no further question would arise regarding the future disposal of that name. But the status of the name *Odobenus* Brisson cannot at present be regarded as firmly established, for the book in which it was published—the Second (1762) edition of Brisson's *Regnum animale*—cannot be regarded as a strictly binominal work in the ordinary sense of that term and the question of the status to be accorded to names published in it is at present before the International Commission, on an application submitted by Dr. G. H. H. Tate (American Museum of Natural History, New York) (see paragraphs 26 and 27 of the present Report ; also Tate, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 115 ; and Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission at its Session held in Paris in 1948, published in 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 313-314).

71. In order, in accordance with the decision taken in Paris, to determine the future status of the name *Rosmarus* Brünnich, 1771, it will be necessary to consider the position which would arise if, on considering the application submitted by Dr. Tate, the Commission were to reach the conclusion that in the foregoing work Brisson did not satisfy the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25 and therefore that no name which appeared in that work possesses

any status in zoological nomenclature in virtue of having been so published. In that event, it would become incumbent upon the Commission, under the instructions in regard to such cases given by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (Paris, 1948) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 65), to apply to Brisson's *Regnum animale* the procedure which in Paris they applied to Geoffroy's *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* (see paragraphs 9 and 10 of the present Report), that is to say, to ascertain from specialists whether they were of the opinion that, in order to avoid confusion and in the interests of nomenclatorial stability, it was desirable that certain of the generic names first published in 1762 in the *Regnum animale* should be validated and, if so, which were the names which it was desirable should be so preserved. In view of the fact that, as already explained, the Commission has decided to give a ruling on the future status to be accorded to the generic name *Rosmarus* Brünnich, 1771, the question of the status of the name *Odobenus* Brisson, 1762, is already directly involved and calls for decision by the International Commission.

72. The questions on which the advice of mammalogists is sought in the present case are therefore: (1) If it were to be decided by the International Commission that Brisson's *Regnum animale* of 1762 is not a nomenclatorially available work, would it be desirable that, under the special procedure prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology for adoption in such cases, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should validate the generic name *Odobenus* Brisson, 1762 (type species: *Phoca rosmarus* Linnaeus, 1758)? (2) If the answer to the foregoing question is "No," is the generic name *Rosmarus* Brünnich, 1771, the next name validly published for, and therefore, if *Odobenus* Brisson, 1762, were found not to be an available name, the oldest such name for the genus containing the Walrus?

Case 28: Question of the species to be treated as the type species of the nominal genus "Chinchilla" Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia)

(See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 436-441)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)141)

73. During the War of 1939-45, the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (Chicago) submitted an application asking for a ruling from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature as to the species to be treated as the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia). Dr. Osgood pointed out that Bennett had established the nominal genus *Chinchilla* for a single species, namely the Chilean species (or subspecies) of the true *Chinchilla*. Bennett had not however given a new name to that species but had applied to it the name *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, calling it *Chinchilla lanigera*. Prell (1934) had however come to the conclusion that the species described by Molina was not the true "Chinchilla" but was the so-called "False Chinchilla" or "Chinchilla Rat," a species which was currently placed in the genus *Abrocoma* Waterhouse,

1837, and did not even belong to the same family as the true "Chinchilla." Dr. Osgood had expressed the opinion that, if it were necessary to accept the "Chinchilla Rat" instead of the true "Chinchilla" as the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, long-continued confusion of technical and vernacular names would be inevitable. These difficulties would, however, be completely avoided if it were possible to set aside the claim of the name *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, to be taken into account in considering the question of the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett; if that name were to be ruled out in this way, the oldest name definitely given to the animal on which Bennett had based his genus, i.e. the true "Chinchilla" from Chile, was *Chinchilla velligera* Prell, 1934.

74. This case was carefully considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in 1948. In this matter the Commission was assisted by a decision then taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (on the recommendation of the Commission) that an author who establishes a new nominal genus is to be deemed to have identified correctly the nominal species assigned by him to that genus but that, where there are grounds for believing that a misidentification of the type species did in fact occur, the case is to be submitted to the International Commission which, under this decision, is bound to give a ruling as to the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus concerned; where the Commission is satisfied that a misidentification has occurred, it is placed under an obligation to designate as the type species of the genus the species intended by the original author or, if the identity of that species is doubtful, a species in harmony with current nomenclatorial practice, unless it is satisfied that such action would itself lead to greater confusion than uniformity (1950. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 158-159).

75. Guided by the foregoing decision by the Congress, the Commission agreed that, under the *Règles* (i.e. unless the plenary powers were invoked to vary the normal provisions) the type species of the nominal genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, was the nominal species *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, whatever that species might be. Next, the Commission took note that the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (as published in the foregoing binominal combination) was variously regarded by specialists (a) as a *nomen dubium* (Osgood's view), (b) as the oldest available name for the true "Chinchilla" of Chile (Herschkovitz's view), or (c) as the oldest available name for the "False Chinchilla" (Chinchilla Rat) (i.e. the species commonly referred to the genus *Abrocoma* Waterhouse, 1837, to which the trivial names *bennetti* and *cuvieri* had been given by Waterhouse when he first published the name *Abrocoma*) (Prell's view). Next the Commission agreed that, before a decision could be taken on the question whether it was necessary to use the plenary powers in order to prevent the confusion in technical and vernacular names which would arise, if, under the normal operation of the *Règles*, it were necessary to substitute the "Chinchilla Rat" (*bennetti* Waterhouse, 1837) for the true "Chinchilla" of Chile (*velligera* Prell) as the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, it was essential, if possible, to determine the identity of the taxonomic

species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (as published in the combination *Mus laniger*) properly applies.

76. Having reached this stage, the International Commission invited me, as its Secretary, to confer with interested specialists with a view to ascertaining as rapidly as possible (a) their views on the alternative interpretations of the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, specified above, and (b), in so far as specialists regarded the above name as having been originally applied to a composite species, the views of specialists on the question of the first occasion on which a later author, acting under Article 31, as clarified and amplified in 1948 by the Paris Congress (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 73-76), had definitely selected one of the comprised species to be the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, should exclusively adhere. Finally, the Commission decided to defer further consideration of the late Dr. Osgood's application until the Report asked for had been received.

77. In order that a decision may now be taken on this case, the Commission desires to obtain from specialists information regarding, and advice on, the following questions :—

- (1) Is there now general agreement among specialists either (a) that the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (as published in the combination *Mus laniger*) was applied by its original author exclusively to the true Chinchilla of Chile or (2), if there is no such general agreement, is it generally agreed (a) that the nominal species *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, was a composite species comprising (amongst other species) the true Chinchilla of Chile and (b) that that species was the first of the originally comprised species to be selected by a later author under Article 31 to be the species to which the trivial name *laniger* should exclusively adhere ? (It will be particularly appreciated if specialists furnishing answers to the Commission on the above questions will support those answers with bibliographical references to papers bearing on the above matters.)
- (2) If the answer to the above questions is "No" (i.e. if there is no general agreement among specialists either that the true Chinchilla of Chile was the sole species to which Molina applied the name *Mus laniger* in 1782 or that, although the nominal species *Mus laniger* Molina was a composite species at the time when it was first published, it did then comprise the true Chinchilla of Chile and that species was duly selected under Article 31 as the species to which the name *laniger* Molina is exclusively to adhere), the present case falls to be dealt with under the decision taken, on the advice of the International Commission, by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology as recorded in the *Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission* at its Fourth Meeting held during its Paris Session, Conclusion 11(2)(g) (3) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 76). Under that decision it is provided that, where some specialists claim to be able to recognise the species to which a given specific name applies but other specialists either recognise some other species or are unable to recognise any species, the specific name in question becomes a

nomen dubium and the interpretation of that name is to be referred to the Commission for decision. If, for the reason explained above, it becomes the duty of the Commission to decide to which species the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, shall be applied, is it the wish of specialists that the Commission should (a) direct that the foregoing name shall be held to apply to the true Chinchilla of Chile or (b) that that name should be suppressed under the plenary powers, the oldest available name for the true Chinchilla thus becoming *Chinchilla velligera* Prell, 1934 (without prejudice to the taxonomic question whether that Chinchilla is congeneric with some other Chinchilla having an older available name) ?

- (3) In view of the doubts which have for so long surrounded the question of the identity of the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, it will be essential if that name is to be preserved, for the International Commission, when placing (as it will be bound to do) the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, to insert at the same time a note in that *List* directing the manner in which that name is to be interpreted. In this connection it must be borne in mind that, if the next International Congress of Zoology (Copenhagen, 1953) decides to recognise the concept "neotype" (a subject on which a Report has been asked for for submission to that Congress*), the citation now of a previously published description or figure in the *Official List* for the purpose of prescribing the species to which the name *laniger* Molina, 1782, is to apply will inevitably mean that the specimen on which that description or figure was based will automatically become the neotype of the nominal species *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782. What is the published description or figure which specialists would in these circumstances recommend should be cited in the entry in the *Official List* relating to the trivial name *laniger* Molina? Would the citation of a reference to Prell's (1934) description of *Chinchilla velligera* be considered suitable for this purpose (it being understood, as explained above, that Prell's specimen would automatically become the neotype of this species if the Congress decides in favour of the recognition of the neotype concept) ?

78. When the late Dr. Osgood first submitted the present application to the Commission a few months after the outbreak of the War of 1939-1945, he expressed the view that a decision was desirable at the earliest possible moment ; the war and other circumstances have already led to considerable delay in the consideration of this case, and the Commission is most anxious to reach a decision with as little further postponement as possible. Specialists who are interested in the problem raised in the present case will therefore greatly assist the Commission if they will be so kind as to furnish the Commission as soon as possible with their views on the three questions set out above

* In this connection see pp. 131-147 of the present Volume.

**Particulars of the dates of publication of the several Parts in
which the present Volume was published**

<i>Part No.</i>	<i>Contents of Part (pages)</i>	<i>Date of Publication</i>
1/2	1-60	25th February, 1952
3	61-94	15th March, 1952
4	95-130	
5/6	131-188	
7/8	189-230	15th April, 1952
	T.P.-iv.	

CONTENTS :

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the <i>Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature</i>	Page 189
Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases	189
Preliminary Report on twenty-eight individual nomenclatorial problems remitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for special investigation: an appeal to specialists for advice	191

VOLUME 6

The publication of Volume 6, which is concerned with individual nomenclatorial problems, was interrupted to permit of the publication of Volume 7, which is concerned exclusively either with general problems of nomenclature which will be considered by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, or with particular problems specifically remitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for special investigation. Now that the publication of Volume 7 is complete, the publication of Volume 6 is being immediately resumed. Part 5 of that Volume is being published concurrently with the present (concluding) Part of Volume 7.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

In order to save unnecessary work and to avoid unnecessary delay, specialists proposing either to submit applications to the International Commission or to furnish comments on applications by other authors published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* are particularly asked to submit those applications or to furnish those comments (1) typewritten on one side of the page only, double-spaced and with wide margins, and (2) in duplicate. Where comments are furnished on more than one application, each comment should be typed on a separate page.

All communications relating to the scientific work of the International Commission should be addressed to Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.